Claims 1-4 were pending and were rejected. Claims 1-2 are cancelled. Claims 3-4 are amended. Claims 5-23 are new. No new matter has been introduced.

The previously-pending independent claims were rejected under U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sayre.

Amended claim 3 recites:

> 3. A method for determining a domain of definition (DOD) in a warped image, the warped image formed from an original image, each pixel of the warped image having a displacement from a corresponding pixel in the original image, the original image unrestricted by a border, the method comprising:
>> determining an original DOD associated with the original image, the original DOD comprising a region of the original image with a boundary surrounding useful information, the boundary having a plurality of edges corresponding to a plurality of directions;
>> for each pixel located on the plurality of edges of the original DOD:
>>> determining a location of a corresponding pixel in the warped image; and
>>> determining a displacement of the pixel in the warped image from its corresponding pixel in the original image;
>> for each of the plurality of edges, determining a maximal displacement value of a pixel on the edge in the direction corresponding to the edge; and
>> determining a new DOD for the warped image, the new DOD for the warped image corresponding to a DOD in the original image, each edge of the new DOD displaced in the direction and by the determined maximal displacement value corresponding to the edge of the original DOD.

Claim 3 describes a method in which two domains of definition (DODs) are determined, with the original DOD comprising a region of the original image with a boundary surrounding useful information. The boundary of the original DOD has a plurality of edges, with each edge corresponding to a certain direction. Maximum displacements are determined for each edge in the direction corresponding to the specific edge. The new DOD is determined by moving each edge by the maximum displacement determined for the edge, the displacement occurring in the direction corresponding to the edge. Determining a new DOD allows, for example, tracking all of the useful information of an image. If some of the image moves out of the viewable window due to one operation, tracking a DOD

8

allows portions of the image to be brought back in subsequent views caused by subsequent operations.

The Sayre reference is directed to executing a warping of an image. (See, e.g., Abstract). Original and new DODs are not determined, as recited in claim 3. An original DOD, "a region of the original image with a boundary surrounding useful information, the boundary having a plurality of edges corresponding to a plurality of directions," is not disclosed by Sayre. Claim 3 additionally recites the limitation of: "for each of the plurality of edges, determining a maximal displacement value of a pixel on the edge in the direction corresponding to the edge." Thus, claim 3 discloses determining maximum displacements for each edge for the ultimate displacement of each edge, in a direction corresponding to the edge, to determine a new DOD. In contrast, Sayre discloses a displacement table for use in transforming an image as part of a warping operation. (See, e.g., c4: 38-47). A displacement table generated in the warping method of Sayre is not a DOD of claim 3: a displacement table is a table containing values of relative displacement of pixels (see, e.g., c4: 48-50), and not a region of the image with edges to displace. Accordingly, Sayre does not disclose the invention of claim 3.

Independent claims 10, 17, 20 and 23 are also patentable over Sayre for reasons analogous to claim 3. In addition, dependent claims 4-9, 11-16, 18-19 and 21-22 are also patentable over Sayre, both because they depend from patentable independent claims and because each includes additional patentable features.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone in order to advance prosecution.

9

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. PAQUETTE

Dated: December 18, 2007   By: /Daniel R. Brownstone 46581/
                                   Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No.: 46,581
                                   Fenwick & West LLP
                                   801 California Street
                                   Mountain View, CA 94041
                                   Tel.: (415) 875-2358
                                   Fax: (415) 281-1350
                                   dbrownstone@fenwick.com